

### REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated June 7, 2007. In the Office Action, claims 1-22 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 11, 18 and 21 are amended and claims 2 and 19-20 are canceled. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1, 3, 6-18 and 21-22 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-22 were rejected under various obviousness type rejections. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); M.P.E.P. §2143.

Claims 1 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA), in view of Polizzano (US 4,057,313). The APA referred to is related to the prior art Figure 1 discussed in the specification of the application. Claims 2 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Polizzano, and further in view of Johnson (4,969,834) and in view of Moenkhaus et al. (US 6,500,025). Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to incorporate features of claims 2 and 19, respectfully. Accordingly claims 2 and 19 are canceled. Claim 20 is also canceled. It is respectfully submitted that the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 1 and 18.

The Examiner states that “neither APA nor Polizzano discloses the apparatus including a first electrical plug electrically coupled to the clamp through first and second wire connectors of the clamp and a second electrical plug electrically coupled to the first and the second electrical conductors of the cable, the first and second plugs configured to removably electrically couple together.” Instead, the Examiner illustrates FIG. 7 of Johnson as showing the requisite structure as well as reference to Moenkhaus et al. as disclosing a plug that can be used as a cable connection means.

However, it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references, in particular the Johnson or Moenkhaus et al. references, teach or suggest “a first electrical plug electrically

coupled to the conductive piece through first and second wire connectors of the clamp and a second electrical plug coupled to the first and second electrical conductors of the cable, the second electrical plug configured to removably electrically couple with the first electrical plug to couple the first wire connector with the first electrical conductor and the second wire connector with the second electrical conductor.” As illustrated in FIG. 8 of Johnson, Johnson fails to teach or suggest the cable configuration claimed in claims 1 and 18. In particular, FIG. 8 of Johnson shows connecting means (20) and connecting means (83) coupling charging transfer cables (21) and (24) to charging transfer cables (81) and (83). Charging transfer cable (21) is coupled to attaching means (23) and charging transfer cable (23) is coupled to attaching means (26). Johnson fails to show electrical plugs that couple two wire connectors to a conductive piece of a clamp to two electrical conductors that provide Kelvin connection capability, the two electrical conductors being of a cable that also includes a main electrical charging conductor.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 18 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 3, 7-8 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Polizzano, and further in view of Kowalski et al. (US 5,772,468). Claims 3, 7-8 and 22 are in condition for allowance at least based on their dependence on allowable base claims 1 or 18.

Claim 6 was rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Polizzano as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Vonderhaar et al. (US 6,469,511). Claim 6 is in condition for allowance at least based on its relation to allowable base claim 1.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Polizzano as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Yoshikawa et. al. (US 4,983,086). Claim 9 is in condition for allowance at least based on its relation to allowable base claim 1.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable APA in view of Polizzano as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Hatrock (US 4,983,086). Claim 10 is in condition for allowance at least based on its relation to allowable base claim 1.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Potizzano, and Johnson as applied to Claim 19 (now part of amended claim 18), and further in

view of Vonderhaar et al. It is respectfully submitted that claim 21 is in condition for allowance at least based on its relation to allowable base claim 18.

Claims 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et. al. (US 6,796,841) in view of Polizzano, alternatively further in view of Morse et. al. (US 5,820,407). It is respectfully submitted that claims 11-14 are in condition for allowance as including features not taught or suggested by the cited references.

The Examiner states that “it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Cheng’s clamp and position all the components with in the handle as taught by Morse et al. in order to protect the connection from diverse weather.” It is respectfully pointed out that Morse et al. includes a half-wave rectifier (36) in the handle of a clamp. A rectifier (36) is not a first electrical plug and a second electrical plug coupled to first and second electrical conductors of a cable that also includes a main charging conductor, the electrical plugs coupled together and housed in a hand grip as claimed. Furthermore, none of the cited references show removing a clamp from a cable by both removing the removable fastener that is structurally claimed in detail in claim 11 as well as unplugging electrical plugs that are structurally claimed in detail in claim 11.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 12-14 are also in condition for allowance at least based on their relation to allowable claim 11.

Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. in view of Polizzano, in view of Morse et. al., and further in view of Vonderhaar et al. It is respectfully submitted that claims 15 and 16 are in condition for allowance at least based on their relation to allowable claim 11.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over. Cheng et al. in view of Polizzano, in view of Morse et al. and further in view of Hatrock. It is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is in condition for allowance at least based on its relation to allowable claim 11.

New claim 23 depends from claim 1. As previously described, none of the cited references teach or suggest a first electrical plug and a second electrical plug coupled to first and

second electrical conductors of a cable that also includes a main charging conductor, the electrical plugs coupled together and housed in a hand grip as claimed.

It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1, 3, 6-18 and 22-23 are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Leanne Taveggia Farrell/  
Leanne Taveggia Farrell, Reg. No. 53,675  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244  
Phone: (612) 334-3222  
Fax: (612) 334-3312

LTF/jmt